

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of July 21, 2009, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 3 and 4 were canceled previously. Claim 31 has been added in the present paper. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 2, and 5-31 are presented for examination upon entry of the present paper. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 29, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. pat. no. 5,651,006 to Fujino et al. ("Fujino"). This rejection is traversed below.

Amended independent claim 1 recites features related to managing at least one further managed object directly through at least one manager object, and managing the at least one managed object by the at least one manager object via an intermediate object, wherein the management of the at least one further managed object and the at least one managed object occurs *only* through a single communication network. Illustrative, non-limiting written description support for the amended features recited in claim 1 may be found in the filed specification when read as a whole, and for example, at page 9, line 27 – page 10, line 7 and Figure 6.

At pages 14-15 of Applicant's "Amendment" filed April 29, 2009, Applicant distinguished features related to managing at least one managed object and at least one further managed object through a single communication network as recited in claim 1, and Fujino's (alleged) management of objects through a plurality of communication networks. Applicant incorporates those remarks herein by way of reference.

The Office Action at pages 3-4 contends that it is reasonable to classify a number of LANs and WANs (as described in Fujino) as a single network by virtue of their physical connection, regardless of their logical relationship. Moreover, the Office Action at pages 3-4 asserts that the WAN or LAN shown in Figure 1 of Fujino satisfies the recited "single communication network" because the claim language does not exclude any other sub-network.

The amendments to claim 1 clarify that management of the at least one further managed object and the at least one managed object occurs only through a single communication network. For reasons similar to those discussed above, Fujino teaches away from such an arrangement because Fujino describes any alleged management activity taking place through a plurality of communication networks (e.g., LANs 1-3 and WAN 4). Accordingly, Fujino fails to anticipate claim 1. As such, claim 1 is allowable over Fujino.

Claims 29 and 30 are allowable for reasons substantially similar to those described above with respect to claim 1, in view of the features recited therein.

Claims 5, 7, and 8 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujino in view of U.S. pat. no. 5,438,614 to Rozman et al. ("Rozman"). Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujino, in view of U.S. pat. no. 6,639,893 to Chikenji et al. ("Chikenji"). Claims 9-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujino, in view of U.S. pat. no. 6,044,468 to Osmond ("Osmond"). Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujino, in view of Osmond, and further in view of U.S. pat. no. 6,519,635 to Champlin et al. ("Champlin"). Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujino, in view of Osmond and Champlin, and further in view of U.S. pat. no. 6,032,197 to Birdwell et al. ("Birdwell"). Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujino, in view of Osmond, Birdwell, and Champlin, and further in view of U.S. pat. no. 6,236,341 to Dorward et al. ("Dorward"). Claims 16-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujino, in view of Rozman, and further in view of Birdwell. Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujino, in view of Osmond and Champlin, and further in view of U.S. pat. no. 6,539,540 to Noy et al. ("Noy"). Claims 21, 22, and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujino, in view of Osmond and Champlin, and further in view of U.S. pub. no. 2002/0052946 to Yoshino ("Yoshino") and Noy.

Claims 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujino, in view of Osmond, Champlin, Yoshino, and Noy, and further in view of U.S. pub. no. 2001/0044822 to Nishio ("Nishio"), U.S. pat. no. 6,421,425 to Bossi et al. ("Bossi"), and U.S. pub. no. 2002/0029228 to Rodriguez et al. ("Rodriguez"). Claim 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujino, in view of Osmond, Champlin, Yoshino, and Noy, and further in view of U.S. pub. no. 2002/0188708 to Takahashi et al. ("Takahashi"). These rejections are traversed.

Claims 2 and 5-28 are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims, as the additional references of record fail to remedy the deficiencies of Fujino described above (notwithstanding whether any such combination of references is proper).

New Claim(s)

Claim 31 depends from claim 14 (and, ultimately, from claim 1), and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claim 31 recites "wherein a compressed message is generated responsive to the acknowledgment of a sequence which appears periodically in the at least one part of the respective messages prior to compression." Illustrative, non-limiting written description support for the features recited in claim 31 may be found in the filed specification when read as a whole, and for example, at page 20, lines 17-25. While claim 31 has not been examined to date, Applicant offers the following remarks in an effort to expedite the prosecution.

At page 16 of Applicant's "Amendment" filed April 29, 2009, Applicant distinguished the features recited in claim 14 from Birdwell. Applicant incorporates those remarks herein by way of reference. In short, the features of claim 14 relate to a compression operation based on an acknowledgment of a sequence which appears periodically in at least one part of respective messages. Conversely, in Birdwell, a compression operation is not based on an acknowledgment of a sequence which appears periodically in a message because in Birdwell any such alleged periodicity is established after the compression has taken place.

Responding to Applicant's prior remarks discussed above with respect to claim 14, the Office Action at page 5 contends that: (1) of the multitude of compression operations in existence, it would be reasonable to say that a decompression operation (citing Birdwell at col. 2,

lines 25-32) is related to and falls under the category of “a compression operation,” and (2) a compression operation, prior to reception by the client, can be considered to be based on a periodic sequence. The Office Action further contends that the compression operation is the entire compression/decompression and the transmission/reception of a packet between source and destination where the periodic sequence plays an integral part.

Claim 31 is directed to the generation of a compressed message (responsive to the acknowledgment of a sequence which appears periodically in the at least one part of the respective messages prior to compression), as opposed to any decompression activity that may take place as part of a larger compression operation (in accordance with the Office Action’s interpretation of what is a compression operation). Furthermore, the compressed message of claim 31 is distinguishable from any such alleged compressed message generated in Birdwell because the compressed message of claim 31 is generated responsive to the acknowledgment of a sequence which appears periodically in at least one part of respective messages prior to compression, whereas any periodicity in Birdwell is the result of a compression operation having already taken place. Accordingly, claim 31 is further allowable over Birdwell (and any of the additional references of record, in any combination, notwithstanding whether such combination is proper) in view of the features recited therein.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that no fee is required for this submission. If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: October 16, 2009

By: /Mark E. Wilinski/
Mark E. Wilinski
Registration No. 63,230

1100 13th Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001